



BALCH & BINGHAM LLP

Alabama • Georgia • Mississippi • Washington, DC

Eric B. Langley  
(205) 226-8772

Attorneys and Counselors  
1901 Sixth Avenue North, Suite 1500  
P.O. Box 306 (35201-0306)  
Birmingham, Alabama 35203-4642  
(205) 251-8100  
(205) 226-8799 Fax  
www.balch.com

(205) 488-5680 (direct fax)  
elangley@balch.com

December 2, 2009

Marlene H. Dortch  
Office of the Secretary  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, SW  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Re: GN Docket 09-51  
WC Docket 07-245  
WC Docket 09-154

**EX PARTE NOTICE**

Dear Ms. Dortch:

On December 1, 2009, Russ Campbell, Karen Flewharty (Oncor Electric Delivery) and I met with Louis Peraertz, Acting Legal Advisor to Commissioner Clyburn relating to pole attachment issues in the above-referenced dockets. During the meeting, we made the points expressed in the attached handout, as well as other points consistent with the comments and other submissions filed by my firm in the above-referenced dockets on behalf of Oncor Electric Delivery Co., Florida Power & Light Co., Tampa Electric Co., and Progress Energy Florida, Inc. ("Electric Utilities").

Later than same day, Russ Campbell, Karen Flewharty and I met with the Broadband Team relating to the same issues. During the meeting, we made the same points expressed in our earlier meeting with Mr. Peraertz. The Commission participants in the meeting with the Broadband Team were as follows: Kevin King, Rebekah Goodheart, Elvis Stumbergs and Nick Sinai from the Broadband Task Force; Jonathan Reel, Jeremy Miller, Marcus Maher and Al Lewis from the Wireline Competition Bureau; and Julius Knapp, Chief of the Office of Engineering and Technology.

During both meetings we also briefly discussed the attached representative map (from the National Rural Electric Cooperative Associations' website). Specifically, we discussed the potential for Commission pole attachment policy to positively impact broadband deployment in unserved and underserved areas versus the risk of compromising electric distribution infrastructure safety and reliability.

Pursuant to Section 1.1206(b) of the Commission's rules, a copy of this notice of *ex parte* communication is being filed electronically in the above-referenced matter. Please contact me if you have any questions.

Marlene H. Dortch  
December 2, 2009  
Page 2

Very truly yours,  
/s  
Eric B. Langley

#### Attachments

cc: Mr. Louis Peraertz (via email with attachments)  
Mr. Kevin King (via email with attachments)  
Ms. Rebekah Goodheart (via email with attachments)  
Mr. Elvis Stumbergs (via email with attachments)  
Mr. Nick Sinai (via email with attachments)  
Mr. Jonathan Reel (via email with attachments)  
Mr. Jeremy Miller (via email with attachments)  
Mr. Marcus Maher (via email with attachments)  
Mr. Al Lewis (via email with attachments)  
Mr. Julius Knapp (via email with attachments)

# Pole Attachments & Broadband Deployment

**GN Docket 09-51  
WC Docket 07-245  
WC Docket 09-154**

***Ex Parte* Presentation by:**

**Florida Power & Light Co.  
Tampa Electric Co.  
Progress Energy Florida, Inc.  
Oncor Electric Delivery Co.**



BALCH & BINGHAM LLP

## Electric Utilities

Company	Customers	Poles
Florida Power & Light	4.5 million	1.1 million
Progress Energy Florida	1.7 million	1.1 million
Tampa Electric	0.7 million	0.3 million
Oncor Electric Delivery	3 million	2 million
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>9.9 million</b>	<b>4.5 million</b>

# Issues at Stake

- Preserving the Safety and Reliability of Electric Distribution Infrastructure
- Maintaining the Infrastructure Partnership between ILECs and Electric Utilities
- Unifying the rate for CATV and CLEC Broadband Attachments

# Safety & Reliability

- ❑ This is the most important issue to the Electric Utilities
  - Should be important to communications attachers
  - Same infrastructure supports broadband attachments
- ❑ Safety and Reliability are two separate concepts
  - Separate terms in Section 224(f)(2)
  - A practice can be “safe” yet compromise reliability (and vice versa)
- ❑ Electric utilities own the vast majority of poles in their service territories

# Specific Safety & Reliability Concerns

- ❑ Make Ready Deadlines
  - Unrealistic, unnecessary and unlawful
  - Would elevate speed-to-market over safety and reliability
- ❑ Unification of Construction Standards
  - One size does NOT fit all
- ❑ Pole Top Access for Wireless Antennae
  - Like construction standards, should be a local issue
  - Each utility should make its own decision

# Make Ready Deadlines

## ❑ UNREALISTIC

- Scope and complexity of projects vary significantly
- Too many factors beyond pole owner's control

## ❑ UNNECESSARY

- Electric utilities have no incentive to delay
- Anecdotal evidence of delay does not meet the "burden of proof"

## ❑ UNLAWFUL

- Electric utilities are not required to expand capacity (perform make ready) under Section 224(f)(2)



# Construction Standards Are Local Issues

- ❑ Preserve local discretion over standards
  - Pole attachment standards are just ONE PART of an electric utility's overhead distribution standards
  - Utility and state specific issues (construction materials and techniques, geography, weather, industry)
  - Florida Hardening proceedings
- ❑ NESC should not be a "ceiling"
  - NESC is a safety code, not a design code
  - NESC is the "floor" in many states
- ❑ Commission can ensure non-discriminatory ***application*** of standards without ***creating*** standards

# Wireless Pole Top Access

- ❑ “Communications Space” has legal meaning
- ❑ What is the issue?
  - NOT whether it can be done safely
  - BUT whether electric utilities should be ***required*** to allow wireless antennae in power supply space
- ❑ Pole top attachments present special safety and reliability concerns (loading profile, worker safety, maintenance precautions)
  - Given these concerns, each utility should make its OWN decision
  - Commission can/should ensure non-discriminatory application

# Solving the Right Problems In the Right Way

- Is the problem lack of broadband competition in the population-dense areas served by investor-owned electric utilities?

**OR**

- Is the problem lack of broadband at all in areas of rural America served primarily by electric cooperatives and munis?

# Pole Attachments Are Not a Barrier To Broadband Deployment

- Make ready charges are ACTUAL COST items
  - Capex to attachers may, indeed, be a factor in deployment
- If make ready slows broadband overbuild, implement a “rocket docket”
  - Complaint–based resolution
  - Relies on specific and unique facts of case
- Annual rental fees (opex) are NOT a barrier to deployment

# What Should the Commission Do?

- ❑ Decline the request by CLECs to micro-manage matters impacting safety and reliability of electric distribution systems
  - No make ready deadlines
  - No unification of construction standards
  - Local decisions re: wireless pole top access
  
- ❑ Continue to regulate by exception
  - Commission can ensure non-discriminatory application of standards
  - Complaint-based adjudication of access disputes
  - Implement “rocket docket”


# Infrastructure Partnership

- ❑ ILECs and CATV/CLECs are apples and oranges
  - ILECs typically pay NOTHING in “rental” when they are in parity of ownership
  - Joint Use is premised on infrastructure cost-sharing
- ❑ No fundamental change in relationships since 1996 Act
  - Pole ownership changes are slight
  - ILECs place same or increased burden on poles
- ❑ Pole Attachment Act does not cover ILEC attachments on electric utility poles

# Broadband Attachment Rate

- ❑ Electric Utilities support unified rate for CATV and CLEC broadband attachments
  - Should be Telecom Rate with tweaked presumptions
- ❑ VOIP Petition for Declaratory Ruling can resolve this issue
- ❑ No presumptions re: rates for wireless antennae
  - Configurations vary too much
  - Telecom formula can/does serve as a guide

# America's Electric Cooperative Network



National Rural Electric  
Cooperative Association

A Touchstone Energy Cooperative

